

# TO DREAM THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM

In the first two issues of this column a model has been set forth of the University of Nebraska of the future, the University we are creating today by our actions and thought.

It would be a University which through leadership assumes its responsibility to its students and its society. It would be a University whose three parts—students, faculty and administration—working together try to bring about a better world. It would be a University that instills in all its inhabitants the moral sense, or insight, needed to keep the unfolding drama of human history going.

But now after perceiving this faint glimmer of the University of the future, and of the world of the future, we have to ask, "What will the student of this University be like?" and "Where does the student of today stand in relation to this model?"

The student of the new University must have a mature understanding of how a University and a society operate. He must try to understand the various power structures, or lines of power, that envelop not only the people he criticizes, but also envelop him.

He must change these power structures when he sees that they help or perpetuate one particular group of people and their ideas to the detriment of the well-being of the University as a whole. The time for selfish concern and advancement is gone; the betterment of the whole must come first.

The new student will not merely try to destroy one power arrangement for the personal satisfaction of setting up his own in its place. An irresponsibly-run "student controlled" University is just as wrong as an irresponsibly run "administration-controlled" University. We have got to realize that the task of creating a better University and world is a task that can only be won by working together.

**The Student Today**  
From reading the "Rag" in the last few weeks, it seems many students have as yet not attained the realization that their first concern has got to be what is good for the University community as a whole. They fail to see we all must work together, or we will all surely fail.

The student of today still seems to believe in the naive idea, or is it a hope, that the world, the University, its people and its institutions can be divided into good and evil categories. It is this way of thinking that enables many students to call their opposition merely the "Administration."

The "Administration" very quickly becomes everybody's universal bad guy. This is done because it is easier to attack people than it is to attack and change the power structures they represent. This approach to building a better University is not only naive, but it is also dishonest and an escape for those who use it, for it is far easier to say our own inadequacies and weaknesses are the result of the "Administration" than it is to admit they are at least in part our own fault.

Granted, the Administration of this University has made mistakes in judgment. Far too long this University has resisted the trends of higher education by supporting policies, campus structures and institutions that are no longer meaningful. And the job of the responsible student is to point out these mistakes and work for their correction. But at the same time, we must admit the mistakes made by the students and the faculty.

The student body of this school has not at any time been willing to assume adult

roles in the University and the world. The vast majority have been content to sit back most of the time, and let other people make decisions that affect their lives and that should only have been made by them. We have run away from the awesome responsibilities of living in a complex world, and either intentionally or unintentionally have merely become the raw material our society uses and needs to perpetuate itself.

Erich Fromm's psychological concept of "escape from freedom" explains at least in part this phenomenon. We lack the courage to face life as free men who must make decisions and accept all the consequences that follow as a result of those decisions.

This state of affairs is true not only of this University, but also of our world and nation. How else can one explain the prevalent feeling today in our society toward political, economic and social issues—the feeling of "Let Joe do it!" "It's no concern of mine."

We do not want it to be a concern of ours, for a concern demands some sort of a response from us as men. We would rather live in the superficial and secure world of unconcern than the real, challenging but threatening, insecure world of concern. We are afraid to be men acting in time; we shirk the demands of life. Perhaps a concise way of explaining what is wrong with us is that we are afraid to be wrong. We lack the moral courage to DARE TO BE WRONG.

**Making The New Student**  
This prevalent feeling has got to be destroyed on this campus before we can ever hope to work coequally with the faculty and administration in creating the University of the future. This is the real challenge facing our campus leaders today. Their task is to lead the student body to a greater understanding of what it means to be an adult in the University and the world.

To be sure, the job of slow education of an entire student body is less glamorous, and less politically opportune, than crusading for rights and other current issues, but it is the foundation upon which any of these other things in the end must be based.

We have got to realize that, to a large extent, things like the Bill of Rights are in themselves neither good nor bad, but neutral. The element that determines to what extent they are good or bad is the quality of men who live by them and use them. We too often think all we have to do is create structures, like governing bodies and committees, and as a result, life will be better. Belief in this idea explains why so many campus structures and institutions, even ASUN, are irrelevant to the majority of students.

Many campus leaders have been content to live in their own little world and play their "in" game of politics, a game relevant only to fellow players of the game. Instead of this, leadership demands that one go back to the student body and educate it, lift it up morally and intellectually, awaken it to its responsibilities and duties.

Granted, this task of education in the hopes of improving the quality of men is difficult, but it must be done if the new citizen of the University of Nebraska and world is to arise.

"The Impossible Dream" of a truly "human" world will either be realized or lost to the extent this job of education is done by campus leaders and others.



## 'As You Like It': A Rare Experience

By Pete Clark  
Department of English

General conversational comments on college Shakespearean performances, of which this critic is admittedly guilty, usually consists in the sad echoing of that most frequently heard capsule criticism, which begins, "It's not a good production, but..."

After the conjunction, the formula of disappointment is completed in four main ways: "but after all, it's Shakespeare," "but it has one good scene," "but one mustn't miss X's performance," or "but the staging is exciting."

However, this is not the case with the Howell Memorial Theatre's production of *As You Like It* which opened last Friday evening.

And being such, the role of critic is an unfortunate one. For, as the immortal Bard would readily admit, it is far easier to portray faults than to describe nobility. And Mr. William Morgan has indeed produced a fine and noble rendering of this fanciful tale of pastoral love and romance.

In a society so deeply reconciled to doves and hawks, as ours seemingly is, there is but little recognition of the fanciful lark. And yet this is what *As You Like It* affords us. And perhaps, as Mr. Morgan would have us believe, its rediscovery is long overdue.

Shakespeare has here embowelled the Virgilian myth of "the Golden Age" and the Christian myth of "the Garden of Eden": a primeval forest where death and time are distorted. There are no clocks in Arden and thus we are temporarily suspended in an absurd fantasy. A fantasy which Shakespeare in turn invests with the politics of vision.

The opening set, designed by Charles Howard, correctly conveys the idyllic nature of Arden by having it framed in the fashion of a 16th century pastoral miniature. By using it as a background for the court scenes, Howard expresses the necessary contrast between the two worlds.

To dramatize his vision of the nature of true love, Shakespeare chose for his "action" the complex and intricate interrelationships that arise among four pairs of ill-met lovers who reflect various conflicting notions of love.

Love is presented primarily in the romance of Rosalind and Orlando, and by contrast, in the traditional pastoral idealism of Silvius and Phebe and in appetite and humorous urgency surrounding Touchstone and Audrey.

Miss Bobbie Kierstead is a bewitching Rosalind and a delightful Ganymede. She successfully carries the well-balanced nature of Rosalind, who (though in love and in Arden) is still capable of self-interest, self-criticism, and an awareness of time.

Bill Jamison measures his romantic Orlando with the correct amount of underplaying that is necessary to effectively contrast the absurdly bombastic sentimentalism of Silvius and Phebe.

Tom Doty and Roni Meyer judiciously hyperbolize these respective roles, although their physical accoutrements and demeanor—resembling too closely the courtly gentry and not the rustic shepherd-folk—tends to undercut the complete spoofing intended by Shakespeare. This is, however, the only instance of improper costuming is an otherwise praiseworthy job by Aileen Castellani.

A stunning Celia is presented by Miss Jean MacLaren, who exhibited a purity of diction, correspondent to her noble stature, that is infrequently found in Shakespearean performances.

Bruce Borin's interpretation of "villainous" Olivier was quite convincing, though too much so in light of his later reversal.

Kristi Rapp was an eye-catching treat, if somewhat overdone, in her portrayal of Audrey as the original prototype of "The Farmer's Daughter" and the Renaissance precursor of Auntie Mame's endearing secretary.

It is Touchstone and Robert Hall, however, who earns the loudest plaudits from this reviewer. His satirical wit as the court clown is enjoyably enhanced by the Douglas Fairbanks-Cary Grant devil-may-care bearing he brings to the role.

The "action" of the play then consists in the various confrontations of these character-types with one another, which serve both to crystallize their identification and to clarify Shakespeare's ultimate conception of love and its role in society. And this conception can be seen in the breaking down of illusions throughout the play.

Rosalind refutes the romantic illusions of Silvius, Phebe, and Orlando. Touchstone, representing the world of the courtier, wittily rebukes the pastoral illusion proffered by Corin, an aged shepherd. Shakespeare in the latter scene is insisting that one must not be deluded about reality, even if one is a character in the play.

So too does Shakespeare stress the illusory qualities of the audience's fantastical experience, thereby reconciling the ideal with the actual. Although this is accomplished in part through Touchstone's wit, it springs mainly from the musings of melancholy Jaques.

Jack McCoy plays the part with a subtle lightness which properly undermines the view of Jaques as a caustic misanthrope filled with bitterness.

He is rather a "doubter" or "questioner" who stands on the edges of Arden and acts as a stabilizing force on the audience, reminding us that Arden is but a temporary limbo from which we must shortly return (like Orlando and Rosalind) to the actual reality of society.

What then would Shakespeare have us bring back? It is the assurance that the old, just society (represented in the play by faithful Adam) will be restored and reconstructed. This is symbolized in Hymen, the institution of marriage, at the end of the play.

The human community is now affirmed by the lovers' comprehension and acceptance of social responsibilities. And this is coupled with Shakespeare's assurance that by participating in the human community one can triumph over time through generation.

Shakespeare is thus dealing with what a man is and how he expresses his being, how he can be healthy, creative, and religious, how he is balked by nature (even Arden is subject to the seasons and natural elements) and how he is balked by society, and how he can transcend that.

In *As You Like It* Shakespeare is able to imply that the goal of total freedom (thought to be the illusory Arden) for man lies in self-imposed restriction and responsibilities and to obey the source of virtue—through love—is to know joy.

*As You Like It* has a distinctive structure that seems disjointed and unstructured but that has a strange logic of its own. The social reality for Shakespeare is here presented in terms of fantasy, a fantasy which is a man's vision. He has employed unmotivated types rather than characters to allow the audience to study the vision rather than to identify with its personages.

Any emotion, excluding that of comic laughter, from the viewers comes with the final epic spectacle of people entering into a social condition while holding a conception of man and society that supports the validity of that social condition.

Whether they try to perfect it further is of no consequence. For as witnesses who propound it, they are affirming the good. And it is this affirmation of human potentiality which Shakespeare intends.

The cynical Jaquian theatregoer might retort that Shakespeare is here revealing outrageously his own self-delusion. On the contrary, this is not self-deception. It is a type of absurd confidence and optimism that, strangely, exists today only among certain twilight specimens of the American personality.

And it is in this regard that *As You Like It* takes on added import for the modern American society. We have in this country, a mythology of self-reliance and social consciousness and yet, because of our bourgeois preoccupations, the practice of such confidence has become the "greenwood" province of the "outcast", the "ignorant", and the "paranoid".

*As You Like It* is indeed a rare experience: by nature of its fantastical form and by virtue of its penetratingly perceptive content.

## CAMPUS OPINION

### Grounds For Condemnation

Dear Editor:

I find your articles on the sub-rosas rather subjective—not because I think they (sub-rosas) are bad nor do I think that they are good.

I have been on campus since 1962 and have seen the articles on sub-rosas. The point is you state that they stand on sick and perverted ground.

Those that I have talked to know nothing about sub-rosas. I know nothing about them. Except, of course that you and administration are against them. Is this sufficient grounds for me to condone or condemn? I think not.

I believe that your "expose" of sub-rosas is aimed at a population who is no longer on campus. A small percentage of students knows anything about them, except what you publish, which, good or bad, is slanted.

If you wish to degrade something, give the newer, less enlightened students some basis for your condemnation.

Paul Fisher

### Everyone Is Asking

Dear Editor:

I offer some questions which every conscientious student should be asking himself.

Taken from The Abridged Manual For Determining Sub-rosa Affiliation and the chapter entitled "Some Questions Which Every Conscientious Student Should Be Asking Himself," these profundities should enable every student to logically re-evaluate his friends and determine whether they are attempting to undermine the loyalty which the student shows to his fraternity or sorority.

1. Does your girl insist on "going out" on dates rather than sitting around the fraternity house?

2. Why does your mother offer to do your laundry every week-end?

3. Is grandmother sending you chocolate chip cookies in packages labeled "educational material"?

4. Does your friend carry a wallet-sized picture of Giles Corey?

These are only a few exceptions. Enterprising students will undoubtedly compose their own manuals to make this the best of all possible Halloweens.

Dennis Hilger

### The Growing Giant

Dear Editor:

What is this concept, known as student rights? That spawned from grievances to futile fights.

It grew from words; of student politicians, Of radicals, then scheming coalitions. Against us all this growing giant strains, Though grown from nothing—yet nothing it remains, Save fuel to fire the mouths of mindless men: Men who save their banners high, and then...

Discard them for a better-sounding song, And sign of Rights, be they right or wrong. When protest serves as just a mental crutch, Then, the student doth protest too much.

For like a howling dog he cannot see That it alone's a Right enough to be The guest of such a host, so kind and grand, And yet he turns to bite the feeding hand, When he has given nothing in return And has been given most of what he's learned. If minds be bared in learning textbook knowledge, Some barest minds of all are found in college

Tiresias.

### Return To White Towers

Dear Editor:

I see by an article in Wednesday's Daily Nebraskan entitled "Off Campus Costs High and Leadership Suffers," that I am either not the average off-campus student or that I can't add as well as I thought—my avaricious heart has been gloating (when I am not slaving over the housework or fixing unappetizing meals) over the money I thought I was saving—but maybe I forgot to consider the cost of light bulbs, or of vitamin pills to keep myself from collapsing of malnutrition.

Having considered the dangers to my health, my social life, and my bank balance, I have decided to rush back to the friendly white towers (through whose windows, by the way, a refreshing cool breeze blows all winter long) and provide the University with the leadership of which I have so selfishly deprived it by living off campus.

Penthouse Dweller

### Auschwitz's Cook

Dear Editor:

Would you believe that Abel's food director once cooked for the Auschwitz concentration camp? Probably not, but who would believe rice, peas, and stewed tomatoes all mixed together and served under the title of "vegetable"? It's true.

And isn't it poor that students, living in the heart of Nebraska beef country, are served beef that is quite probably imported from Argentina? Or is it beef? It is fair to say this if one was to grind up the best roast beef that Abel can afford, he would have mediocre hamburger. But, what in God's name is the stuff they label hamburger? Who says horses are obsolete!

The effects of a prolonged Abel lard diet are pronounced. Take my roommate. He's a scrawny, 150 pound sophomore. This fact doesn't tell you much by itself, but consider this one: in Sept., 1965, Wayne Meylan was afraid of him. Finally, a memo to Coach Devaney: if Harry Wilson is really too fat, let him eat over here for a while.

Tired of Good, Plain Food

### Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 96, No. 24

Oct. 24, 1966

Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.  
Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Advertising Service, Incorporated, Published at Room 51 Nebraska Union, Lincoln, Neb., 68518.

TELEPHONE: 477-6711, Extensions 2538, 2589 and 2590.  
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$6 for the academic year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacations and exam periods, by the students of the University of Nebraska under the jurisdiction of the Faculty Subcommittee on Student Publications. Publications shall be free from censorship by the Subcommittee or any person outside the University. Members of the Nebraska are responsible for what they cause to be printed.

#### EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: Wayne Krenschner; Managing Editor: Lois Guitard; News Editor: Jan Hahn; Night News Editor: Bill Minner; Sports Editor: Bob Flumch; Senior Staff Writers: Julie Morris, Randy Irey, Tom Victor, Nancy Hendrickson; Junior Staff Writers: Cheryl Trill, Cheryl Dunlap, John Fyfe, Bob Hobson; News Assistant: Eileen Wirth; Photographers: Tom Rubin, Howard Keninger; Copy Editor: Paul Bennett; Bar Robertson, Jane Ross, Bruce Glim.

#### BUSINESS STAFF

Business Manager: Bob Glim; National Advertising Manager: Dwight Clark; Local Advertising Manager: Charles Baxter; Classified Advertising Managers: Rae Ann Glim, Mary Jo McDunnell; Secretary: Linda Lader; Business Assistant: Jerry Wille; Jim Walters; Chuck Salen; Rusty Fuller; Glenn Friend; Brian Hale; Mike Evers; Subscription Manager: Jim Buntz; Circulation Manager: Lynn Hansen; Circulation Assistant: Gary Meyer.

# That's What It Says

By Ed Schwartz

"Back to school" magazine articles do not generally produce significant insights into contemporary education, but this year's Newsweek contribution may be something of an exception.

Referring to an almost "psychedelic" temperament on college campuses this fall, the article cites a new wave of introspection, reminiscent of the apathy of the '60s. What began as a burst of energetic progressivism in 1963 and 1964 is ending as an acute melancholia in 1966.

The same spirit permeates the campus itself. To be sure, there is an unparalleled interest in educational reform and spurts of life from former coldbeds of silence. Nonetheless, the idea which seems to intrigue students the most is that of the "T-Group"—Sensitivity Training Sessions which involve exploration into the innermost thoughts and feelings of the participants. And the brooding has developed its morbid side—Moderator Magazine predicts 1,000 student suicides this year.

**Campus Psychoses**  
The Moderator story, unfortunately, was more descriptive than analytical—kind of a guided tour of campus psychoses. One quotation from a report on the NSA Student Stress Conference last year, however, focuses on a central part of the problem: "Our solution is to inject into the system more human qualities, the most obvious of which is emotion..." "We want ideas that are worth some passion."

Feelings—that's the key. The present generation of students wants to

feel. Furthermore, they are attempting to do so in a culture which makes exercise of emotion extremely difficult. Hence, the transition from politics to psychology cannot be considered a "new" trend. It is rather a new phase in a general pattern of development on the campus of the '60s.

Ed Friedenberg's "Coming of Age in America" documents many reasons why in terms of their high school experience, college students might seek, or avoid overt expression of emotion. The high school, he finds, is "like a bad book: sentimental, extrinsically motivated and intellectually dishonest."

**Stifles Openness**  
When this is reinforced by the good old "competitive spirit and an elaborate structure of rules, they serve to stifle openness of any kind." What comes out, Friedenberg observes, "is uniform, bland and creamy, yet retains, in a form difficult to detect, all the hostile or toxic ingredients of the original mixture."

The "original mixture" was stirred up a bit in the early '60s. Needless to say, Kennedy was a major factor in legitimizing the passions of youth. The Civil Rights movement played a large part—demonstrating, as it did, the results of our indifference to a large segment of the population. Students were allowed to feel—they were given an opportunity to vent emotions through quasi-acceptable channels. They responded.

The important point is that the response was as much an expression of personal emotional needs as

"new social consciousness." Snider critics often attacked this—revealing, perhaps, their own fear of expressing themselves. Today, Civil Rights groups have grown suspicious—white middle class kids with "hang-ups" don't always make the most effective organizers. Nonetheless, the "Feeling Factor" was and is a major consideration.

**Feeling Factor**  
Today the Feeling Factor has had to find new expressions. The war in Viet Nam; the draft; the general aura of Johnsonism do not provide the clear-cut moral imperatives which instantly command dedication. The ineffectiveness of the anti-war movement has contributed to an overall sense of frustration.

The new forms of expression—"T-Groups"; "psychedelic drugs"; "privatism in various forms"—are, as yet, rudimentary. While a few have been grabbed too hastily—LSD is a little more volatile than a march in Selma—the willingness to explore may yield techniques which could be beneficial to the entire society.

Yet, in the long run, the real task will be integration—of finding ways to relate the emotional needs of students to the intellectual discipline which enhances their expression and development. This has always been the task of the artist; the rest of us must accept it now as well.

The essence of style is that it embodies form and substance. In the past, we were satisfied with form; in the psychedelic phase, we accept only substance. At some point, we have to find both.